

As this session of Congress moves forward, it is my hope that both issues will be addressed. Certainly the Indian physicians who come here next week for the legislative conference will go around to the various congressional offices and explain why managed care reform and objective criteria for international medical graduates is something that they should all support in the interests of the American people.

#### UPDATE ON THE CAMPAIGN FINANCE INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as we close this week, I thought I would inform my colleagues and anyone else who may be paying attention that, regarding the investigation that I am charged to chair involving illegal foreign campaign contributions and the possibility of people in very high offices of this country breaking the law, we are now up to 89 people, 89 people who have been associates or friends of the President or political allies or contributors, 89 people have either taken the fifth amendment or fled the country.

□ 1400

A lot of my colleagues have asked me about the progress of our investigation. I tried to explain to them that we are making some headway. Charlie Trie, one of the friends of the President who had fled the country and gone to China, has now returned. He is under indictment and we believe there is negotiations going on with him of a plea bargaining nature, but we are not sure about that. The fact of the matter is there has been an indictment of Mr. Trie, a personal friend and associate of the President. We have a number of others that we believe ultimately will face indictment.

But the biggest problem we face with the investigation is getting people to talk to us. Toward that end, we have asked the President to contact people who have fled the country to come back and appear before the committee so that they can help us get to the bottom of all these allegations. So far the White House, the President and the White House, has not been cooperative in asking foreign governments to insist that these people return. We have got James and Mochtar Riady in Indonesia whom we would like to have come back. We have asked for the assistance of the White House in convincing these gentlemen, who are executives of the Lippo Corporation and friends of the President in Indonesia, to help us get them back. So far we have had no cooperation.

We have asked the President and the State Department to work with us to get people back from other countries like China. We have not had that success. As a matter of fact, the Chinese

government would not let my investigators even get a visa to come to China to investigate these allegations of illegal activities.

So we are having a difficult time. The President I understand is going to be going to China before too long. There will be Members of Congress, I understand, accompanying him. I would like to urge the President to postpone his trip until China allows my investigators to go in there and to give them visas so that they can do the job that they have been charged by the Congress to do.

Mr. Speaker, I hope if the President or any of his friends at the White House or any of his colleagues here in Congress happen to be paying attention, I hope they will urge him to send a message to China that any diplomatic missions to China will be deferred until we get some cooperation from the Chinese government regarding our investigation. I think it is unbelievable that all the trade that we do with China, all the business that we do with China, all the breaks we have given to China, even in spite of their human rights violations, which are legion, they will not cooperate by allowing our investigators to have a visa to get into China.

Mr. Speaker, I will just end up by saying that we want to get to the bottom of all this to finish this investigation as quickly as possible. If the President would just come forward and talk to us, if his friends would not take the Fifth Amendment and would come forward and talk with us, we could conclude the investigation rapidly. I would urge all those involved to give us their cooperation so we can get it concluded. That is what the American people want.

#### REPORT ON THE CAPITAL CITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the House a report on the capital of the United States and its progress in relieving itself of financial and management distress.

Mr. Speaker, this House has had, and justifiably so, a special interest in its capital city. Almost 3 years ago the capital of the United States met the same fate as several large cities before it, as Cleveland, as New York, and as Philadelphia. The capital found that its bonds were no longer at investment grade and it could no longer borrow money without the assistance of a control board. To its credit, this House, working in a bipartisan fashion, passed a bill, very much like bills that had been passed to assist other cities who had met such problems. That bill preserved self-government in the District of Columbia, but as a result of quarrels between city officials and the control

board and as a result of a pace that perhaps was too slow in fixing the city's problems, the Congress, largely through the appropriation committees, infringed upon self-government in the District of Columbia. And so we have a strange situation to be sure.

The capital of the United States has less democracy than any other piece of American soil. I know that this body joins me in wanting to assure that this state of affairs does not last much longer. I have indicated to my own constituents in the District of Columbia that, though they have every reason to be outraged that there would be any less democracy here than elsewhere, there is only one way to assure that democracy will be restored and that we will go further and have the same level of democracy as the States and the territories, and that is for the city to quickly bring itself to the point where particularly its services and operations are services that the residents of the District of Columbia, first and foremost, can be proud of, that every American would be proud of, and that of course this Congress would be proud of.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is my obligation to keep this body informed of whether or not progress is indeed being made, especially since this body and the other body were concerned that progress had been too slow. Very substantial changes are beginning to occur and very substantial progress is beginning to be made, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, it is my intention to come to the floor sometimes in 5-minute debate period, sometimes in one-minute debate period, and sometimes for a special order debate period, as today, and report to this body on progress that is being made.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago I came to report that the District was actually experiencing a surplus 2 years ahead of when the District budget was supposed to be balanced on an annual basis under congressional mandate. I reported that in a 1-minute speech before the House and I noted that Members on both sides of the aisle applauded, and I remember saying, only half jokingly, Mr. Speaker, let the record show that this body applauded for the District of Columbia. I know that this body will indeed applaud when the capital city of the United States is brought back to its full majesty.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin with a report not of the surplus and what it contains, not of the large picture, but, rather, of a small part of the picture that I think would especially please this body. Of all of the services in the District of Columbia, none has the attention or perhaps deserves the attention that this body has given to education. This body knows where to focus on when it looks to see whether the city is improving, and so it has looked at the schools and it has looked at education.

Mr. Speaker, on the front page of the Washington Times, just yesterday, I

was surprised to see a report, something that I did not know of, and I doubt that anyone in this body knew of. The headline reads, Mr. Speaker, "Computer Castoffs Inspire Teens."

Mr. Speaker, this is a report of how at one D.C. school, Wilson High School, students are taking outdated systems and computers, repairing them and rebuilding computers, this in a city which has had to beg, borrow, I will not say steal because that has not occurred, computers. This school needs 400, it has 150. But what is amazing about this piece is that there is a teacher at Wilson High School who decided to make a course of getting old computers, taking them apart and repairing them. The students keep a journal of the steps they go through to repair the computers.

They obviously learn much about the complicated nature of these machines. There are some of us trying to become computer literate. These youngsters are beyond literacy and into making the things, making them work. They have a computer lab. This is the largest public school in the district. It has got almost 1600 students. What it has done, one teacher, many like him, the problem is they do not make the front page of the Washington Times or any other newspaper, one teacher is doing what I would imagine is probably not being done anywhere else in the United States; if so, by very few. And that is not only teaching youngsters how to become computer literate but getting deeply analytically into computers.

Can you think of any better way, Mr. Speaker, to teach youngsters problem solving or how to exercise their analytical faculties? Can you imagine the confidence a youngster gets who has not thought himself very good at much to learn that he can actually work on computers and make them work again and work for every one?

Apparently these renovated computers can also be borrowed and taken home by a student so long as that student remains in school. So the computers do double duty. They help youngsters to understand that there is a reason not to drop out of school in a town that has had a high dropout rate.

Mr. Speaker, the progress in the schools has been difficult to make. I point out this progress because it is at that level that the progress is being made and it is at that level that this body is likely to hear too little just by the nature of things. I want to say something further about the schools, again, because of the special interest of this body in schools and because so much that is good is happening in schools. I have to tell you, it is not good enough for the residents of the District of Columbia. There is still a lot of contention around the schools, but compared to where we were, I think this body would be pleased to see forward movement. There is concern that the schools open three weeks late because the roofs were not fixed in time. Well, for some of us, we remem-

ber when the roofs were not fixed at all. Of course, what happened was that a whole bunch of roofs got fixed and are still being fixed and when roofs on schools are fixed, then all kinds of damage and other problems that come from leaky roofs also disappear.

May I take this opportunity once again, Mr. Speaker, to thank the 254 Members of the House and Senate who during that three-week period when school was closed answered my call to take youngsters from D.C. high schools as interns.

□ 1415

I want to thank those Members. And there were many who buttonholed me, staff and Members alike, to tell me how these youngsters were doing, helping them as volunteer interns in their offices.

Some of my colleagues may know that we have started a small program, to become larger in the summer and to be full-blown next year, for permanent volunteer interns from the D.C. high schools to come into the House and the Senate. My colleagues can imagine what this will mean to youngsters in the District. Here they are in the Nation's Capitol, and the Capitol to them is an awesome, almost fearsome place, especially when we consider the power this body has over the District that it does not have over others, almost unapproachable. And here they are invited in by Members of this body and of the other body to actually work in their offices.

The experience was a salutary one for the youngsters and for the Members, and I thank the Members for the way in which Members, I must say, of every persuasion and tendency and across both sides of the aisle answered this call.

I have a special program, indeed, called D.C. Students in the Capitol because of the unapproachable nature of the Capitol to the folks who live here. And it says teachers should bring their students. There is a time when they come, I meet with them for a few minutes, they tour the Capitol, they get to sit in on a hearing, and they get to feel at peace and at home with this place.

Now, I recognize that even though the facilities are being improved, even though, frankly, top to bottom, changes that have not yet fully manifested themselves are going on, that there continues to be great concern about the schools. I want to speak about one program that thrills me.

The District, like almost every other city in many States, has social promotion. They have social promotion because they do not know what to do with the youngster. They do not want to keep the youngster back because they think that will hurt the youngster's self-confidence. They do not want the youngster to be larger, bigger than the other kids. They just move them forward. And the harm that that does ought to be clear by now, but, frankly, one of the reasons it continues

to be done is people do not do the grunt work it takes to figure out a better way to do it.

Arlene Ackerman, the new chief educational officer of the schools, has done just that. She has started a program called Summer Stars Program. Twenty thousand students this summer are going to have made probably so little progress, because Ms. Ackerman just got here and the reforms are just beginning, but instead of being socially promoted, these youngsters are going to go to what would have been called summer school, but is no longer called that because it is no longer that.

It is the beginning, here in the Nation's capital, of a year-round school, the kind of school we think every jurisdiction in the United States should have today. Do my colleagues want to know why Japanese kids do better? Not because they are smarter. They do better than American kids, blacks, whites and Hispanics, because they go to school longer, and they study harder. That is the key to it.

Well, for youngsters who are behind, they will be in the first class of the year-round school. Now, the year-round school is going to have classes in the evenings during the regular school year so that many kids next year will not have to go to school in the summer because they will be part of the year-round school program.

But students who score below basic on the so-called Stanford 9 test in both reading and math must go rather than be promoted. These students must go even though they have not been retained in their grade. And ninth-graders and seniors who need one credit to graduate or for promotion must go to this Summer Stars Program.

They are also telling students who should go who they are. And there are a whole set of students who should go, who do not need to go, who we expect to go, because if they do not go, they are going to need to go. This, we think, is the way to approach education today; not by screaming and yelling and engaging in the kinds of fads that education tries out year by year and still leaves us with the same problems, but by doing the grunt work to figure out what we need to do to get hold of it.

These youngsters are going to receive highly structured remedial work with 2 hours of reading and 2 hours of math. They will receive phonics instruction. They are going to receive oral language activities. They are going to receive writing activities. They are going to receive individual instruction. They are going to receive group instruction. They are going to receive computer instruction.

They are going to go to school, grades 1 through 11. First-graders are going to go, and people about to go into their senior year are going to go, and all the grades in between. And they are going to go for 4 full hours a day; 8:30 to 12:30. And then some will go from 8:30 to 1:30, and some will go from 3:30 to 8:30 for enrichment programs.

There will be 10 middle schools, 10 high schools and 60 elementary schools; 15 students to one teacher. These youngsters are going to learn when that is the student-teacher ratio.

Who will be the teachers? There is going to be not only an internal search, those teachers already there, but there will be an internal and external search. Only applicants with outstanding qualifications will be selected for the year-round Summer Stars Program. The initial screening of these teachers is going to include a writing sample, for example.

One of the reasons my colleagues have seen me on the floor in opposition to the vouchers program that some still continue to propose for the District is not only that I do not think that is the best thing, the best way to approach education for the majority of the youngsters, but I have a very special reason this year, Mr. Speaker, and that is this program.

This Summer Stars Program is simply too good to be turned away for yet another experiment, whether it is vouchers or, frankly, my favorite experiment. If there is \$7 million for youngsters for private vouchers, who would say that that money should not be used for this first year-round program to end social promotion in the Nation's capital? Who would say that that is not, at this juncture, given where the District of Columbia public schools are and where the city itself is, that the best use of that money would not be that?

It takes \$10 million to run this program. If \$7 million are to be found in a vouchers program, and the Congress is serious about the attention it has paid to schools, it will help us start this first year-round school. It will help us to become a model for Baltimore, for Philadelphia, for New York, for L.A., for Chicago, for the small towns and the large cities that need to do precisely this kind of thing.

I have started with the schools, Mr. Speaker, because the schools have been, and rightly so, of special interest and special concern to this body. I do want to make a correction, because people, for understandable reasons, when they talk about the District, talk about the District 4 years or even 10 years ago. And one of the things I hear from time to time is that the District has the highest cost per pupil in the United States.

Well, that may have been so once, Mr. Speaker, but it has not now been for a very long time. The District has downsized tens of thousands of employees and perhaps too much in the schools, if anything. Now, an independent analyst tells us that the District is spending about \$7,000 per student, and even that amount includes our payments to the teacher retirement fund, which often is not included in per-pupil reports.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is important to have a sense of what that \$7,000 figure means. The best way would be to

compare the District to its immediate region. We are at \$7,000; Prince George's County, \$7,120; Fairfax County, \$7,650; Montgomery County, \$9,000; Arlington County, \$9,300. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues should see straight away that that means the District of Columbia has the lowest per-pupil cost in this region, even though it has by far the largest number of children who need special care and special programs.

We cannot talk cost anymore. We have to say to the District that they have to do the best they can with what they have. But if the Congress, in its wisdom, has additional money, it has to put that money where the biggest payoff is for the average child in this system.

And as my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, the average child in this system can do a whole lot better. Arlene Ackerman said, for example, in a hearing we had just this week, that District of Columbia students will be reading the equivalent of 25 books this next school year. In one fashion or another, each child is going to read the functional equivalent of 25 books. That is what I call raising standards and raising standards big time.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress should come forward now and help us raise those standards. I ask my colleagues not to dash the hopes and the efforts of the District by going back to one of my colleagues' favorite notions. If my colleagues are for vouchers, bring a voucher bill before the floor and vote it up or down. My colleagues control the House and the Senate. Better yet, find some districts that, in fact, would like vouchers and make sure that they, in fact, get vouchers. But when we have a district that has voted 89 percent against vouchers, who in America would say that in the face of that, a body of people, where no one represents the District with a full vote, should overturn what 89 percent of the people of the District of Columbia have said?

But I do not come to the floor to have another philosophical or ideological fight on this floor about vouchers. This is too serious, Mr. Speaker. We are now to the point of where we are seeing real progress in the District; a surplus, movement on school facilities, a new chief educational officer who has her head on straight and knows that we have to raise the bar and youngsters will jump to meet it. Help us help them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the best news for the city overall has been the emergence of a general fund surplus. This is a city that had the exact opposite only 2½ years ago. Its audit was in such bad shape that it could not even get a so-called clean opinion, because in order to get a clean opinion from the auditor, all the papers have to be in shape so the auditor can, in fact, know whether the entity is in shape. The District got a clean opinion this year and reported a general fund surplus of \$185.9 million.

The District clearly continues to attract my colleagues' constituents to

this city. Whatever the District's reputation, people are coming in larger numbers than ever. We have the largest turnout of tourists ever.

□ 1430

The economy of the city is beginning to come back, Mr. Speaker. One indication of that is the sale of homes in the District. All across the region there is beginning to be some greater sale of homes. But when we look at the District and compare it to the rest of the region, we know that something very different and very important is happening in this city and that it is moving forward.

The District over the past year had a 31-percent increase in the number of homes sold. The next highest in the region was only 17 percent. The District is coming up with almost twice as much of an increase in homes sold as the rest of the region. If that is not some indication that there is a return in confidence in the city, I do not know what is. When people decide to move here and live here and buy a home here and risk their capital here, they are saying that something has turned around in the City.

Mr. Speaker, may I thank this body for contributing to those figures? Because, although those figures were going up, I believe that a bill passed by this body at my request last year has helped to make home sales go up; and that is a bill that was included in the tax benefit package, that is a \$5,000 home buyer tax credit. Essentially, it says that if they have an income and they are joint filers up to \$130,000 or single filers up to \$90,000 and they buy a home in the District of Columbia, they can get a tax credit up to \$5,000.

I do not need to tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that that is enough to make some people go out and buy a house or a condominium, and it certainly is enough to make some people who are renting in a house or condominium to say, I think I might stop paying the rent man and pay myself and buy this house and get a tax credit.

I have strongly supported the kinds of tax credits that have this effect, and I want to thank this body here and now for helping to make what was already a housing sale increase sail forward even faster.

Mr. Speaker, when I look at the budget surplus, and remember those home buyers are going to be paying taxes to the District of Columbia in sales taxes and other kinds of taxes and that is going to ease the burden of the District, but when I look at the surplus the City is already showing, I want my colleagues to know that it is not simply because we have a good economy. This administration deserves credit for its role in the good economy, and it has gotten credit from both sides of the aisle.

I certainly take nothing away from the President and the administration when I say that some of the credit belongs simply to good management in

the District of Columbia, at least when we are talking about the surplus that the District is now experiencing. The District is now collecting taxes from people it did not collect taxes from before because its system for collecting taxes was in such disarray.

The District's deficit had, in part, to do with the fact that the District would wait weeks upon weeks to cash checks. Now it cashes a check within 1 day.

When the Chief Financial Officer was hired, he found records scattered in boxes on floors. Mr. Speaker, I cannot say enough about what it took to clean that kind of mess up. They could not go to a computer and push some buttons and say voila. Somebody had to get down on their knees, go through these files and straighten them up and computerize them.

Surplus is due as well to other internal controls. Reducing, for example, the improper extension of emergency contracts. If somebody gets a contract and then he keeps on getting it on an emergency basis, the City may never know whether somebody else would do that same job for less. Those kinds of controls are showing up now as part of a surplus. Extensive training of agencies and of accounting staffs have been part and parcel of this improved management.

Mr. Speaker, there have been real sacrifices made to achieve these improvements. Employees in the District of Columbia have not gotten a raise since 1994. Imagine what that would be like. Imagine what our Federal workers would think if we were to deny raises in that way.

I had to press the school system when they came before us just before Christmas because there were workers in the school cafeterias, the lowest paid workers there, who had not received a wage in 7 years, even though there were arbitrator awards twice awarding them wages and they had begun to be paid. So we cannot get work out of people if we continue to deny them annual raises.

What is good about what is happening, Mr. Speaker, however, is that accountability is being demanded for increases in pay; and it is that accountability that is different about the way the District is approaching its business. The District still has to reduce its government more, and it has a long way to go to get the kind of government that District residents deserve.

But Mr. Speaker, let me put before you another figure that will surely convince you that the District has turned the corner. There has been a 20-percent decrease in crime and a 40-percent decrease in homicides over the last year. We were hitting in the top when it came to crime. Everybody else's crime was going down. Ours continued to go up.

The District is now at the end game of recruiting a new police chief. It has got a half dozen top-notch people competing for the job. By moving analyt-

ically, step by step, on reorganizing the police department, putting more and more cops into the streets, and there is still more to go there, reorganizing the department into community policing, we have gotten an almost immediate payoff in the reduction of crime. There is nothing more important that could have been done, even more important, if I might say so, than schools, than to reduce crime.

People are not going to live in a city where they fear for their lives, and the reduction in crime is a salient indicator that this body would surely want to use in deciding whether progress is being made in the District of Columbia.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a good friend and Member wrote a dear colleague when I asked that money for vouchers be spent on the year-round program, the Summer Stars Program, this summer, in order to finally, finally, eliminate social promotion. A good friend responded that, no, we could continue to use that money on vouchers, as he apparently desires, because the District can simply use its surplus to fund the year-round program.

Wait 1 minute, Mr. Speaker. In last year's appropriation, the District was admonished to use every cent of its surplus to pay down its deficit. The District is still carrying an accumulated deficit of over \$300 million. When I say that your capital is a balanced budget, I mean on an annualized basis, the way this country has a balanced budget on an annualized basis but is carrying a huge deficit.

So the District is carrying an operating deficit from the time when it went down and went bankrupt. Now, the District was told, and I thought prudently, do not spend that surplus. Do not use it on anything, not even your schools, not even crime. Use it to pay down your debt. Do not borrow to pay down your debt.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to hear anybody say now that the District should use the surplus for the Summer Stars program, especially when Members of this body are coming forward and saying that there is \$7 million to be used on school vouchers. That money should be used for the Summer Stars program; and the District should, in fact, use its surplus to pay down the deficit.

The only other function that it has identified for use for some of this surplus is for the management reform that this body has mandated on the District. The District must have not only its finances straightened out but its management straightened out in 4 years if, in fact, the control board is to sunset. And I know that the howls from this body about the disarray of the operations of the District of Columbia are such that they would want the District to spend that money first on deficit reduction, then of course on straightening out its management. And there we are into something that will not even be done by the end of 4 years when the

control board is to go, because part of the District's problem is an almost absence of technology in its agencies.

Would you believe, Mr. Speaker, the District still has rotary phones in most of its agencies? We cannot even do computers as long as we do not have push button phones.

So certain kinds of priorities are there. If there is money for schools, it certainly should go for Dr. Ackerman's Summer Stars program. The District should do what the Congress told the District it should do.

The Congress said, the District should use all the money to pay down the deficit. It also said, the money should be used for tax cuts for D.C. residents. I am trying to get a tax cut on the Federal side for D.C. residents with a bill that has strong support from the Speaker and the majority leader that would be a progressive flat tax.

I would certainly like to see some reduction in D.C. taxes, but I think that the Chief Financial Officer is correct when he says that the reduction in city taxes, given the outstanding deficit, should take place on a planned course as the city is downsized and improved so that all of that occurs in tandem and so that we do not throw out of sync the very good building of a surplus that has begun to occur.

Mr. Speaker, the improvements in the District abound, and I am going to be coming forward with others. I must speak at some length about one that I think almost no one expected. The District was on not the dirty dozen list, because there is a whole lot more than a dozen cities on the list of troubled public housing authorities, and the District was big-time on that list.

Two and a half years ago a man came from Seattle, Washington, to try to take hold of this chaos and put it back together again. The District, over 20 years it had more directors of its public housing than anybody could count. The District, frankly, was no different from other troubled public housing; but nobody expected anything to happen.

When we talk about things we can at least do something over the short run, perhaps we think of schools and public housing. Well, in 2½ years David Gilmore, to his great credit, has taken the District off the list of troubled housing authorities.

□ 1445

The District had a score of 22 out of 100 when he came here. Now it has got a score of 65.5, which puts it well up in the list of housing authorities around the country. It is how David Gilmore has done this that I think we all should take note of. I have said to District officials, everybody ought to sit at the knee of David Gilmore, because here is a man who obviously knows how to manage people, manage ideas, and manage hardware. Somehow he has put them all together. He has moved the crack addicts and the nonpayers out of public housing. I do not even hear anybody screaming about it. He knows

how to manage people so that that occurs. He moves into a public housing complex where he sees that the whole thing has to be taken apart and you have to start all over again.

What does the man do, Mr. Speaker? The first thing he does is to put in the sod. Can you imagine the effect it has on public housing tenants who have lived with crime and chaos for years to see somebody coming in, he says he is going to fix it and they hold down, they hunker down and prepare to have dust and nails and debris flying all around them. But they wake up and the first thing they see that morning is that the sod is being planted.

This is a man who knows how to manage people, Mr. Speaker. He knows how to bring hope to the hopeless. What he has done is to organize tenant societies within those public housing authorities. You can imagine what happens when you have moved out the troublemakers, moved in the sod, fixed the public housing, got it in shape again.

There is a new chief of police for public housing. Mr. Speaker, I have met with that man. He tells me that his job mostly consists of getting stray dogs and cats and taking them back to their owners, because the people are taking care of their own renovated public housing, because we have got in place a man who knows what he is doing.

I have to tell you that I do think that is the key to everything in this world. I think that perhaps David Gilmore with all the good work that is being done in the District is the very best and is something to teach everybody, from the Control Board to the Mayor, to the City Council, to the Member who represents the District and the Congress, because he has put it all together. When you go to him and tell him about a problem, he fixes it, he finds a way to fix the system to have you get to him more quickly. He knows how to hire good people, and he knows how to take the staff who is there and to get work out of them and to get rid of those you cannot get work out of.

There are all the stories in the Washington Post or the Washington Times about how the whole world is being shook up down at the public housing authority. I think this man needs to write himself a manual and pass it out. And first pass it around the District and then pass it around the country, because he is showing us something about how to fix a broken city. Yes, it was broken, Mr. Speaker. You are listening to a fourth generation Washingtonian. When my hometown became broken, there was a very special level of sadness for this Washingtonian, because my own great-grandfather, Richard Holmes, walked away from a plantation in Virginia. No runaway slave, Richard Holmes, he just walked off a plantation in Virginia in the early 1860s and came across the river to the District and planted the Holmes family here. Somehow or the other, through our 4 generations in this city, with

problems that you might expect would have occurred in the early part of this century when my grandfather entered the D.C. fire department, later on when my father was in high school during the Great Depression, in 1954 when I was sitting in Dunbar High School, segregated, and heard the bell chime and the principal tell us that the schools would now be integrated under Brown v. Board of Education, to the time of my own children. Through all of that, Mr. Speaker, throughout this century, there was no time in which this city saw the bitter, bitter experience of bankruptcy.

So for me, it was a time of special trial, especially since it was during that time that I represented the District and it was I who came forward and said that it had to have a Control Board. That was painful, but it was necessary, because it is necessary to do what has to be done for a city when it has to be done. I have shared the disappointment of this body that what had to be done has not been done as quickly as it should have been done and, if I may say so, Mr. Speaker, could have been done. And so you have not found me to be an apologist for the District. You have found me to be its defender, to ask people to step back and treat the city with respect, but no apologist for a city that does not stand up and do what has to be done to save itself. And so that is what the city is doing now.

Mr. Speaker, the city has a great challenge. It was able to keep its population, because it is such a livable city, much longer than most large American cities which experienced a total drain of residents. The District did not begin to experience that until the late eighties and now we have come to that moment, so that the great burden on the city now is to recoup and retain its middle class. The District has had a frightening loss of residents. It is experiencing that just as it is beginning to turn the corner and get its full majesty back. But once that drain continues to occur, it is very difficult to turn it back.

That is why the \$5,000 homebuyer tax credit passed by this body has been so important. The fact is that between 1989 and 1997, Mr. Speaker, the District has shown itself to be losing 3 times as many residents as it lost in the whole of the 1980s. In other words, we are having devastating population loss. People do not look to see if the budget is balanced, if there is a surplus or even if the public housing is being fixed to decide whether to cross the District line, going the reverse of where my great-grandfather came when he came to Washington. Instead, they simply go where the grass seems greener.

Mr. Speaker, they do not even look at what business sees. While we have been losing population, business has been coming back to Washington, again, Mr. Speaker, an indication that something important is happening in this town. Look at the new MCI Cen-

ter. That was located in Prince George's County. That has done a reverse migration from the suburbs to the city. Mr. Speaker, the MCI Center has been built by Mr. Abe Pollin. He has built it 100 percent with his own money. There is virtually no other example of an arena in the United States that was built with private money. Arenas are being built almost exclusively with taxpayer money. Why would Mr. Pollin build an arena in the capital of the United States with his own money? Mr. Speaker, he knows something that I hope this Congress finds out soon and that business clearly knows first. There is money to be made here.

There are 20 million visitors who come each year. I see some of them in the galleries. This is a city with unused economic potential. There is a wonderful infrastructure here. There is a metro that brings a whole region into the center of the city and so Mr. Pollin, who took his arena out of the District 20 years ago, has brought it back in a marvelous new center where the Caps and the Wizards, if you please, now play, as does Georgetown University and other teams from the region. But the very fact that somebody would build an arena with private money and take it from the suburbs and move it back to this city tells you that the capital of the United States is coming back and coming back fast.

If you need another example, let me give you one just as spectacular. In the United States today, convention centers are built everywhere, in small towns, big cities, little hamlets, everybody wants a convention center. You build it with taxpayer funds because that is the only way you can get it built. But not in the District of Columbia. The hotel and restaurant industry came to the District 3 years ago and said, "Tell you what, District. Tell you what we're going to do. We're going to tax ourselves and build the convention center ourselves."

Why would the hotel and restaurant industry which complains that it is overtaxed, tax itself to build a convention center in the Nation's capital? They know where the money is, Mr. Speaker. The District cannot attract the big conventions, like the AMA Convention and the ABA Convention because our convention center is too small. Who loses? The District of Columbia loses, which is to say the taxpayers who then have to make up for what visitors to conventions would pay, but the hotel and restaurant industry loses, because those visitors do not come to use their facilities, either. And so instead of waiting the District out, they have stepped up and they will be breaking ground, with their own money, money that is already being built in a lockbox, with their own money, to build the convention center.

Mr. Speaker, you do not build a convention center with private money if you think the city has no future. Mr. Speaker, you do not build an arena in

a city with private money if you think the city has no future. The city has a future. The city is coming back. The first people to understand it are those who have the most to lose, private businesspeople who have put their money where their mouth is, which is what I am asking this Congress to do when it comes to our schools, to put their money on the summer program and not on vouchers, where it will have no measurable effect on the average kid in the District of Columbia.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, you have never seen me give the rosy, merry picture of the District. That is why I have spoken about the frightening decline in the D.C. tax base. I have introduced a bill, as recently as last week, called the D.C. Economic Recovery Act that would give a tax break to District residents from their Federal income taxes. I come forward to do this for the District, recognizing it would not be done for others because the District is a special case and you have made it so, and it is so under the Constitution of the United States.

We have no State, Mr. Speaker. So that when residents leave the District, a very different phenomenon occurs than when they leave Baltimore or Richmond because when they take their money with them, there is no State to recycle their money back to the District of Columbia, as the State recycles money back to Baltimore and as the State recycles money back to Richmond. If there is no State to recycle the money back, then you say, "Well, why don't you tax the people who come in every day to work here and use the same services that residents use here during the day?" The reason we do not do so, Mr. Speaker, is because this body, and the other body, the Congress of the United States, has indeed barred a commuter tax.

So the District is left high and dry. People leave, no way to make up for them because no State to help make up for their flight, and no way to make people who come in and use our services pay for the use of those services because the Congress has barred a commuter tax. I am asking this body to help make up for putting your capital between a rock and a hard place, and I am pleased and may I give credit to the leadership of this body and of the other body for supporting the D.C. Economic Recovery Act.

Mr. Speaker, the figures speak for themselves. We want to hear them now so that we will not be the last to turn out the lights.

□ 1500

The figures speak for themselves. If we look at who the movers are, we see that 25 percent of them earn between \$35,000 and \$50,000, and 38 percent of them earn between \$50,000 and \$100,000. Mr. Speaker, those are middle-income taxpayers right there. That is 63 percent of the people moving in that core, prime middle-income group between \$35,000 and \$100,000. Those are the peo-

ple who pay taxes to the District government.

If the District does not have people to pay taxes to the government, no amount of surplus can make up for the flight of its core tax base. That is why I have introduced the District of Columbia Economic Recovery Act, not as special treatment to the District, but to make up for the special detriment that this body has placed on the District because we believe that that is necessary because it is the capital of the United States.

Who is not leaving the District, Mr. Speaker? Those who make under \$15,000; or put it another way, it is the poor. That is to say, under \$15,000, only 3 percent left. The years I am talking about for these numbers, Mr. Speaker, are 1990 to 1996.

The very rich are not leaving in large numbers either. Only 10 percent of those who make \$100,000 or more are leaving, and we are overly dependent upon these very rich people, and I love every last one of them, and I hope they do not go anywhere.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I could not help but watch with interest the gentlewoman's discussion on the floor here today as the gentlewoman has been talking about her wonderful District, which is our Nation's capital, and I wanted to share with those who are focusing upon the presentation my experience in dealing with the gentlewoman regarding the city.

I first was drawn by way of attention when the gentlewoman mentioned David Gillmor, who is the housing director here and a fellow who we have both worked with, a fabulous public servant who is among those who is trying to make a difference in the Nation's capital and is making a very special contribution.

I also wanted to share with the gentlewoman and others the fact that just a short time ago I returned from a, not exactly a ribbon-cutting, but essentially that, at a Habitat for Humanity, location very close to the Capitol here, where in this case Freddie Mac was presenting a check for \$1 million for a program that the gentlewoman knows as the House That Congress Built.

But as we were doing that, we were also expressing our appreciation for those who come together, in this case to help Ms. Christy Ingram and her family prepare to move in, probably sometime this summer to their new home here in the Nation's capital as a result of partnering that is going on in the city, that is designed to try to make a little difference here.

As the gentlewoman knows, I come from California, but when I am in the Nation's capital doing this job, I am a constituent of yours, for I live in the city. I am very proud that I do. It is a marvelous community that needs all

the help that all of us together should and want to give it. But especially I just wanted to express my appreciation to you and to those of you like David Gillmor who are truly making a difference for all of us who live here.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) for taking the time to come to the floor. I do have to say to this body that the gentleman from California, who represents his own district with great energy and great distinction, nevertheless decides he always has to do good where he is and has initiated a program here that he is now spreading through the rest of the country. He came to me, imagine how I felt, when a distinguished and senior, not in age, but in longevity in the House came to me and said, we want to build a house by the Congress of the United States here in the capital of the United States, and I want to thank the gentleman for his work for the District.

#### NO WAIVER OF JACKSON-VANIK

(Mr. ROYCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago the administration issued a waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, opening the way for OPIC and Exim funds to filter into Vietnam. I was expecting this decision to come from the administration; however, I had hoped that common sense would guide that decision. Vietnam is a Communist country. Its citizens enjoy no religious freedom, little economic freedom, and no freedom to vote, and it is not getting better.

The recent promotion of a hard-line Communist to the Secretary General position, a man who once stated that his government has concerns that foreigners are somehow out to undermine Vietnam's independence, has stalled all hopes of changing the economy in Vietnam. Vietnam is not ready for OPIC. Your support or opposition to OPIC and Exim is not in question here. What is is the government subsidies for businesses in Communist Vietnam.

In anticipation of this decision by the administration, I introduced H.R. 3159, legislation which will now make this waiver null and void. The United States should not extend these benefits to a country that has done little in the way of granting freedom to its citizens. I ask my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation.

#### WHITE HOUSE SILENCE: AMERICANS WANT THE TRUTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITFIELD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized for 10 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, not far away in a United States Federal courthouse, a grand jury may hold in its